

#### 4.2.3.1 Land Resources

##### **Preferred Alternative: No Action Alternative**

Under this alternative, Pu storage would continue at the current interim storage locations at the ICPP and at ANL-W in the ZPPR and FMF vaults in stabilized form pursuant to DNFSB Recommendation 94-1. The ongoing (no new action) activities conform with present and future land-use plans, policies, and controls. Therefore, no effects to land use or visual resources would be anticipated at INEL beyond those of existing and future activities that are independent of the proposed action.

##### **Upgrade Alternative**

##### ***Upgrade Without Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Plutonium or Los Alamos National Laboratory Plutonium Subalternative***

##### ***Modify Existing and Construct New Argonne National Laboratory–West Facilities for Continued Plutonium Storage***

Long-term storage of the existing inventory of INEL Pu material would be accommodated at ANL-W on the INEL site. The proposed facility would be a modification of the FMF on the ANL-W and construction of a new material handling building. Construction laydown area and the operating facility would be situated on previously disturbed land entirely within an upgraded protected area of ANL-W totalling approximately 9 ha (22 acres) and would not create any newly disturbed area. A buffer zone exists between ANL-W operations and the INEL site boundary. [Text deleted.]

**Land Use.** Upgrading existing storage facilities and constructing a new material handling building at ANL-W would have no direct land-use effect during construction or operations. Existing land use would not change and would conform with site development and facility utilization plans. As discussed in Section 4.2.3.8, no in-migration of workers would be required during the construction and operation phases. No indirect effects to offsite land use would be anticipated.

Construction and operation would not affect other land uses at INEL or special status lands. Construction and operation would not be in conflict with land-use plans, policies, and controls of adjacent counties and the city of Idaho Falls since they do not address the potential site.

**Visual Resources.** [Text deleted.] Construction and operation of the facilities would be compatible with the industrial landscape character of ANL-W. The current VRM Class 5 designation of ANL-W would not change.

##### ***Upgrade With All or Some Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Plutonium and Los Alamos National Laboratory Plutonium Subalternative***

##### ***Modify Existing and Construct New Argonne National Laboratory–West Facilities for Continued Plutonium Storage***

The FMF would be modified, and a material handling building would be constructed at ANL-W to accommodate INEL, RFETS, and LANL Pu material. Land area requirements during construction and operations would be equal to the Upgrade Without RFETS Pu or LANL Pu Subalternative (that is, protected area). Direct and indirect effects on land resources during construction and operations would be similar to the Upgrade Alternative, Upgrade Without RFETS Pu or LANL Pu Subalternative.

## Consolidation Alternative

### *Construct New Plutonium Storage Facility*

All the Pu within the scope of the PEIS would be stored at a new storage facility to be constructed at INEL within the Prime Development Zone of the Sitewide Area near the ICPP. Land disturbance would be 58.5 ha (144 acres) during construction of which 56 ha (138 acres) would be used during operations. A buffer zone would be provided between operations and the INEL site boundary. Pu storage in existing DOE storage facilities would be phased out.

**Land Use.** Consolidating the storage of Pu at INEL would be situated on undisturbed land. However, the proposed site is within designated prime development land pursuant to the current *Idaho National Engineering Laboratory Site Development Plan* (IN DOE 1994d:8-4) although existing land use would change. As discussed in Section 4.2.3.8, expected vacancies and historic housing construction rates indicate that sufficient housing would be available to accommodate the estimated in-migration of workers during the construction and operational phases. Therefore, indirect effects to offsite land use would not be anticipated.

Construction and operation would not be in conflict with land-use plans, policies, and controls of adjacent counties and the city of Idaho Falls since they do not address the potential site. Construction and operation would not affect other land uses at INEL or special status lands. No onsite grazing permits would be affected. No prime farmlands exist onsite.

**Visual Resources.** [Text deleted.] Construction and operation would be compatible with the industrial character of INEL's developed areas, which consist of large industrial facilities and stack plumes. The current VRM Class 5 designation of the proposed site would not change.

## Collocation Alternative

### *Construct New Plutonium and Highly Enriched Uranium Storage Facilities*

All the Pu and HEU within the scope of this PEIS would be collocated at a primary new storage plant at INEL, on undisturbed land in the Prime Development Zone of the Sitewide Area near the ICPP. Land disturbance would be 89.5 ha (221 acres) during construction of which 87 ha (215 acres) would be used during operation. A buffer zone would be provided between operations and the INEL site boundary. Pu and HEU storage in existing DOE storage facilities would be phased out. Direct and indirect effects on land resources would be similar to those described under the Consolidation Alternative.

## Subalternative Not Including Strategic Reserve and Weapons Research and Development Materials

Under this subalternative, land effects during construction and operation would be almost the same in extent and magnitude to the Upgrade with All or Some RFETS Pu and LANL Pu Subalternative, Consolidation Alternative, and Collocation Alternative because the facility would be almost the same. However, because the smaller quantity of material would require smaller facilities, it is likely that less land area would be disturbed during construction and used during operations. [Text deleted.]

## Phaseout

No new construction or upgrade of existing facilities would occur under phaseout of the Pu mission. INEL Pu material would be moved out of ANL-W to the Consolidation or Collocation site or to disposition. Potential impacts on visual resources could occur if facilities are not maintained.

[Text deleted.]